



WEI LU  
1218 BUBB ROAD  
CUPERTINO, CA 95014  
JFW

Mr. Bryan J. Fox, Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2617  
Commissioner for Patents  
P. O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RE:

**Application No.: 10/709,485**  
**Inventor Name: WEI LU**

Date: May 31, 2006

Dear Bryan:

Thank you for your letter dated on May 19<sup>th</sup>, 2006 regarding our patent application No. 10/709,485.

After careful review of your office action for this application, I am hereby responding to your action as follows:

I hereby agree to restrict the inventions to **choice 1** as you suggested, which is **“Claims 1-15, drawn to a system or method for a wireless communication device to support various wireless standards, classified in class 455, subclass 426.1”**

If anything else is required, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thanks again for your time.

Yours truly,

Prof. WEI LU

**Prof. Wei W. Lu, Director  
U.S. Center for Wireless Comm.  
P.O. Box 19789  
STANFORD, CA 94309, USA  
wirelessarchitect.com**



## DETAILED ACTION

The Art Unit location of your application in the USPTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to **Art Unit 2617**.

### *Election/Restrictions*

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

*Select  
this  
group  
choice!*

- I. Claims 1-15, drawn to a system or method for a wireless communication device to support various wireless standards, classified in class 455, subclass 426.1.
- II. Claims 15-18, drawn to a mobile device integrated with other devices, classified in class 455, subclass 3.06.
- III. Claims 19-20, drawn to a method of saving costs for a wireless device, classified in class 705, subclass 36.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I, II and III are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, subcombination II has separate utility such as the camera, sensors, radiation detector, etc. Subcombination III has a separate utility such as the cost savings. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

**COPY**